

THE DAILY JOURNAL

SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1900.

Telephone Calls.
Business Office, 231 | Editorial Rooms, 236

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.
DAILY BY MAIL.
Daily, including Sunday, one year, \$10.00
Daily, only, one year, \$7.00
Daily, only, one month, \$0.70
Daily, only, three months, \$2.00
When furnished by agents.
Daily, per week, by carrier, 15 cts
Sunday, single copy, 5 cts
Daily and Sunday, by carrier, 20 cts
WEEKLY.
Per year, \$1.00

Reduced Rates to Clubs.
Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscription to the
JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-cent paper a ONE-CENT postage stamp, on a twelve-cent paper, two, and on a sixteen-cent paper, three. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this paper must be sent to the editor, and be accompanied by the name and address of the writer. Selected manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is enclosed for that purpose.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL.
Can be found at the following places:
NEW YORK—Amor House and Fifth Avenue Hotel.
CHICAGO—Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street.
CINCINNATI—R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.
ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.
WASHINGTON—D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House and Willard's Hotel.

The trouble which confronts the Bryan national convention is that there are too many brands of Democrats.

Representative Sulzer, of New York, and ex-Representative Towne, of Minnesota, seem to be the only Democrats who really desire to ride behind Mr. Bryan.

Mr. Bryan announces that he will not attend the Kansas City convention, and so far no announcement has been made concerning his justly celebrated crown of thorns and cross of gold.

The Bryanites who are assembling at Kansas City tremble when David B. Hill's name is mentioned. It is astonishing how the shadow of an out-and-out Democrat scares a Populist convention.

It is possible that Mr. Clark, of Montana, who expended tens of thousands of dollars to purchase a seat in the Senate, will contribute \$100,000 to the Bryan campaign fund. If he does, Boss Croker, of New York, is the most fitting person to make the presentation.

The man who was caught short on wheat in Minneapolis and failed for \$300,000 was not engaged in business, but in betting on the price of wheat; consequently his mishap should not appear in the weekly lists of business failures. Failures are now classified as commercial or industrial. To this classification should be added speculative gambling.

Speaker Henderson has just been renominated for Congress by acclamation in the Third Iowa district, thus maintaining the remarkable record of never having had a competitor for the nomination since he was first sent to Congress eighteen years ago. If more districts would follow this example there would be more influential and useful members in Congress.

The degree conferred on H. H. Hanna, of this city, by Harvard College, was not Doctor of Laws, as erroneously stated in a dispatch, but Honorary Master of Arts. In announcing it President Eliot referred to Mr. Hanna as "the mainspring of the business men's movement to declare gold the standard of the national currency, a well-tempered spring, intent, assiduous and effective."

Mr. Bryan is said to be so well pleased with the Democratic platform adopted in Illinois that he would be willing to have it taken as a model for the national platform. It endorses "in whole and in part, in letter and in spirit, the national platform of 1896" without any further allusion to the coinage question or the ratio. Such a reaffirmation of the Chicago platform as that will be as offensive to conservative Democrats as the reiteration of each separate plank.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the Indianapolis School Board case is a good thing for the board and the city. It gives the board a free hand in the management of its finances and relieves the city from the danger of having the school debt merged in the municipal debt, thereby bringing it far above the constitutional limit. The decision is based on the view, doubtless correct, that for legal and financial purposes the School Board and the city are separate and distinct municipalities.

The rescue of Admiral Seymour's force, which had a narrow escape from capture or annihilation, leaves the fate of the ministers in Peking the overshadowing question. The reports on this point are so contradictory as to raise a suspicion that the Chinese officials are doing a good deal of systematic lying. If the ministers are safe and under government protection the situation will be greatly mitigated, but if they have been given their passports or are held as hostages it will be equivalent to a declaration of war on the part of China and will greatly increase the seriousness of the situation.

The Kansas representative who is reported as declaring that Pension Commissioner Evans made the rule reversing the practice of the department to base pensions upon several disabilities and pension but for one makes an erroneous statement. The rule was made by a construction of the law in 1891, and has remained the same ever since. Congress, however, passed a law reviving the old rule, which provided that a man may be pensioned at the rate of \$2 a month for one cause of disability, \$6 for another and \$4 for a third, making the pension \$12. Under the rule which has prevailed since 1891 the applicant in such cases as the one here cited would receive but \$4 a month.

are goldies. They are, moreover, able men who will be able to impress themselves upon the convention. These men would drop silver out of the platform entirely, but, failing in that, they will strive for the tannest sort of a reaffirmation of the silver platform of 1896. Thus far, Mr. Bryan insists that silver shall occupy a prominent place in the platform. Doubtless a majority of the delegates are with him, but will they stand firm as they did in 1896? It is given out that the wide difference of opinion will be settled before the convention in a conference of leaders with Mr. Bryan at Lincoln.

A SPLENDID SHOWING.
Yesterday the State Finance Board voted to redeem \$300,000 of the outstanding bonds of the State. Adding this \$300,000 to the amount previously paid under Republican rule, \$2,816,000 of the bonded debt has been paid, leaving the state debt \$4,704,512.12. It is expected that another \$300,000 of the bonded debt will be called in before the close of 1900. It will be said that the reduction is the result of Democratic legislation, which gave the present basis of taxation. After making all allowance for the tax law, the reduction of the debt is largely due to the economic legislation and administration. The state levy for the redemption of the debt would have fallen far short of bringing about the reduction of debt above stated. The savings in the general fund have been so large as to add largely to the total. The payment ordered yesterday was made up of \$217,000 from the levy for the payment of the state debt and \$83,000 from the general fund. If it had been necessary, \$300,000 could have been taken from the general fund.

It should not be forgotten that tens of thousands of dollars annually are saved by the Republican legislation of 1896, which abolished the large fees paid to state officers and put them on salaries. Mr. Henderson, who was the last Democratic state auditor, admitted that he received \$25,000 a year out of office. State Auditor Hart has collected during the first six months of the present year \$128,000 from insurance companies alone. Under the Democratic system, which gave the auditor 10 per cent., Mr. Hart would receive for the fees collected from insurance companies alone in six months \$12,800, and \$25,000 for the year from the fees of the Insurance Bureau alone. The fees of the attorney general during the last four years of Democratic control no one but those who received them will ever know. The late Governor Matthews could not find out. The last Democratic incumbent of the office did not deny the estimate of \$95,000 for two years. Whatever sums are now collected by the attorney general go into the treasury. The fees of the office of the secretary of state, based upon recent receipts now paid into the treasury, could not have been less than \$12,000 or \$15,000 a year. The clerk of the Supreme Court had a large amount of fees, which are not turned into the treasury. In short, the fees paid to state officers under the regime established by the Legislature of 1896 could not have been less than \$75,000 a year, and they may have reached \$100,000. The business-like system of auditing the bills presented to the State for payment has resulted in a large saving to the taxpayers. After yesterday's action by the State Finance Board the annual interest on the state debt 3 per cent. will be \$84,450 less than it was when Hon. A. C. Daily became state auditor in 1896. The \$75,000 or \$100,000 paid as fees to state officers prior to the Republican legislation of 1896 and the amount saved in the interest account thus far would make a good basis for the liquidation of the state debt, which has been reduced 75 per cent. since the Republicans came into control of the State. It is a magnificent showing.

CIVILIZED BARBARISM.
It is an interesting coincidence that at a moment when it civilized world is startled by a violent and murderous uprising of Chinese against foreigners a dispatch from a town in California announces that "two hundred miners and smelter employees last night drove twenty-one Japanese railroad workers out of town." The Japanese were not miners or smelters, and were not interfering with that class of workers. They were simply foreigners. Outbreaks against foreigners are not a novelty in this country. The old Know Nothing party was based partly on that idea and partly on the narrower one of religious hostility. The Chinese have been ostracized and persecuted in this country ever since they first began to come here, and are now excluded by law. If California they are taxed for public school purposes while the schools are not open to their children. An anti-Chinese riot occurred in Denver, Colorado, in October, 1891, in which a large amount of Chinese property was destroyed and more than 150 Chinese were escorted to the jail by the police for safety. In Washington Territory violent attempts to drive out the Chinese were made in 1885-87. At one place three Chinamen were murdered and three wounded, and the murderers were not punished. At another place their quarters were burned. On the 3d of November, 1885, a mob of several hundred men in Tacoma burned all the Chinese houses and stores in the city and ordered the Chinese to leave the place within twenty-four hours, and the order was enforced. In Wyoming the Chinese were so badly assaulted that the Governor of the Territory in his annual message alluded to it as "an inhuman and heartless attack."

The present outbreak in China is chiefly racial, but it is purely religious. Civilized countries also have their religious as well as their racial prejudices. There is not a country in Europe at present that is not at war on the Jews in recent years, and if all the Christians in China be driven out of that country it will not nullify the number of Jews who have been driven out of Europe in the last few years. In Russia they were subjected to the most oppressive legislation, were pushed for defending themselves with weapons while their assailants went free, their houses were destroyed, their stores pillaged and thousands of families were driven out of the country. In May, 1881 no less than 130 houses occupied by Jews were wrecked by rioters in one Russian town, and as many more in the aggregate in other towns. This spirit of proscription and persecution prevailed in every country in Europe. In 1886 the anti-Semitic party in Germany adopted a platform defining as Jew any person in whose family during the last three generations there had been a person of Jewish blood. Even a party gentle family only one of whose members had married a Jew came under the ban. It was demanded

that all such persons be excluded from the legal, medical and educational professions, from the army and the press, and from all public schools; that they be forbidden to have anything to do with public contracts and not be permitted to acquire landed property or carry on business. Finally, no more Jews or persons related to Jews should enter Germany from any other country.

These are some of the barbarities of civilized countries in recent years, legalized or unpunished outrages perpetrated on foreigners or on religionists on account of difference of race or religion. All of the governments under which these barbarities have been perpetrated are now co-operating to punish China on account of an outbreak based on racial and religious hatred. Not a word can be said in defense of the Chinese outbreak or in censure of the powers for trying to protect their citizens, but a fair and judicial comparison of civilized and heathen barbarities shows that the heathen are not the only offenders.

THE GAS QUESTION.
The new agitation of the natural gas question comes at a time when residents of this city can consider the question in all its bearings and make timely preparations for next winter. The decision of the Supreme Court that no company may pump gas out of its wells because the process tends to exhaust a common supply to which all companies are equally entitled will, if sustained, seriously cripple the Indianapolis companies. If the latter have to depend on the normal flow from their wells without being allowed to supply local consumers will fare worse than ever. But the decision of the Supreme Court seems lame in that it assumes as a premise a theory of gas production and supply which may or may not be correct. The courts cannot take judicial knowledge of facts concerning which no court and not even any expert has definite information. In this respect the decision of the court rests largely on guess work. It seems further lame in that it denies one or more companies a right which is equally open to all. Even admitting that no company should be permitted to have a monopoly of pumping, it does not follow that any company may not exercise a privilege that is open to all. No court would hold that any company might not sink as many wells and pump as much water as it pleased from its own land. If water, why not gas? The question is too important to rest on the decision of any but the highest court in the land.

The proposition of the companies to introduce meters as a means of conserving the gas supply probably comes too late to be of much use. If it had been done at first, and not only in this city but in all others drawing on the gas field no doubt it would have added materially to the duration of the supply. But the mischief is done. There has been reckless, criminal and irreparable waste, and to introduce meters now is a good deal like locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. Nevertheless it might do some good, and is worth considering.

It is one of the misfortunes of politics that presidential campaigns unsettle business, and this is particularly the case when one of the opposing candidates represents dangerous principles. If some fidelity and trust company dealing in futures would guarantee the election of McKinley and Roosevelt next fall the American people would begin right now to enlarge business, engage in new enterprises, construct new factories and mills, open new mines and furnaces and build more railroads with the certainty that the investments would pay. Every farmer, every laborer, every mechanic, every factory hand and mill hand, every wage earner of whatever kind would feel that such a guarantee meant for him continued prosperity, employment and good wages. But that feeling will not prevail as long as there is even a remote possibility of the election of William Jennings Bryan.

The State Department has received a copy of a report of trade conditions made by the British consul at Manila, in which he reports great improvements in the city and predicts that under American government and enterprise "Manila may become a great commercial power in these waters before the first quarter of the century is passed." The consul does not discuss the political outlook further than saying that "Law and order are being restored as rapidly as possible," and that "the natives, I believe, would willingly return to their agricultural pursuits, but the influence of their leaders appears sufficiently strong to keep them from surrendering." He might have added that the leaders receive much encouragement from disloyal Americans.

In all the demonstrations of American superiority in manufacturing there has been nothing more surprising than the announcement that the American silk exhibit has been awarded the first prize at the Paris exposition. This is carrying the war into Africa with a vengeance. One does not need to be old to be able to remember when French silk was the only kind worn in this country and when not a yard was manufactured here. Now it seems we are able to beat France in her traditional specialty and on her own soil. According to the last census the manufactures of silk and silk goods in the United States amounted to nearly \$50,000,000.

BUBBLES IN THE AIR.

The Untrammelled Fourth of July.
For real patriotic racket which no ordinance can down, go spend the day we celebrate in a quiet country town.

No Likeness.
Artist—You don't seem pleased with your portrait as a summer girl.
Summer Girl—No; you've made my shirt-waist stripes run the wrong way.

Racket with an Underlying Motive.
"Oh, pa."
"What, Jimmy?"
"Let's fire off on 'em! Fourth all 't powder an' shot!"
"What's he off to fire off at 't? mean old Chinese."

Disapproval of Wu Tung Fang.
"What was it Aunt Minerva said about war with China?"
"She said we ought to conquer the Chinese, if only to teach some civilized United States names to 'em."

The Fatal Error.
"Pauline is nearly frantic."
"What's the matter?"
"She received a letter of proposal from that freckled Mr. Tibbs, and she thinks she mailed her acceptance to Penelope Jones and sent him her cucumber complexion recipe by mistake."

SCHOOL BOARD CASE

THE SCHOOL CITY AND CIVIL CITY SEPARATE CORPORATIONS.

Supreme Court Affirmed the Judgment of the Marion Circuit Court.

SCHOOL BONDS ARE VALID

AND BOTH THE SCHOOL BOARD AND CIVIL CITY ARE RELIEVED.

A Meeting of the School Board Immediately Called to Take Action in the Matter.

The Supreme Court yesterday affirmed the case of Eddy Campbell and others vs. The City of Indianapolis and the Board of School Commissioners, known as the Indianapolis school bond case, holding that the school city and the civil city are independent corporations and that each has authority to incur debts up to the limit of 2 per cent. of the taxable property within their respective boundaries.

The case grew out of an attempt on the part of Campbell, Wild & Co. to enjoin the Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis from issuing school bonds for the purpose of refunding some other bonds issued ten years ago for the purpose of building schoolhouses. Judge Allen, of the Circuit Court, heard the case and refused to grant an injunction, holding that the bonds were valid and that the School Board had a right to refund them. The decision of the Supreme Court yesterday affirms this judgment and in effect decides that the different school cities over the State may incur debts and issue bonds for any proper purpose, and that the refunding of some other bonds issued ten years ago for the purpose of building schoolhouses, Judge Allen, of the Circuit Court, heard the case and refused to grant an injunction, holding that the bonds were valid and that the School Board had a right to refund them. The decision of the Supreme Court yesterday affirms this judgment and in effect decides that the different school cities over the State may incur debts and issue bonds for any proper purpose, and that the refunding of some other bonds issued ten years ago for the purpose of building schoolhouses.

WRITTEN BY JUDGE JORDAN.
The opinion of the court was written by Judge Jordan, after a brief oral argument of the suit and the action taken by the court below in which final judgment was rendered for the defendants, the court says: "It is virtually conceded, and properly so, that the civil city of Indianapolis is not a necessary part to this action. It may be further asserted that it is not even a proper party thereto, and so far as the questions herein involved are concerned, the civil city of Indianapolis may be considered as eliminated from this action."

The cardinal question involved in this appeal, under the facts, is in respect to the validity of the \$100,000 of school bonds issued by the board in 1890, which the present board is now proposing to refund by the issue and sale of new bonds. It is held by a valid act of the Legislature of 1890, which authorized the organization of boards of school commissioners of the school corporation of the city of Indianapolis, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds and contracts for the refunding of the same in issue in this action, been remedied or cured by the provisions of the statute in force at the time of the issue of the bonds of the school city or corporation incurred by the board of school commissioners of the city of Indianapolis, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds of 1890, the attorneys for the appellants, contended that the act was invalid because it violated the act of the Legislature of 1890, which provided that the General Assembly shall not pass laws which shall in any way deprive of enumerated cases, one of which provides for the support of common schools, and that the act of said board in issuing and negotiating the school bonds